317292

LOWER COURT NAME	Electronically Filed CLAIM OF APPEAL		LOWER COURT CASE NO. 13-734-CZ
30th Circuit Ct Ingham Cty.			
Plaintiff / Petitioner Names(s)		Defendant / Respon	dent Name(s)
Gracie Webster and Veronica Thomas		Rick Snyder, Andy Dillon, and State of Michigan	
☐ Appellant(s) ☑ Appellee(s) Attorney John Canzano	Bar No. 30417	Attorney Heather S. Meing	Bar No.
☐ Probate In the matter of	er:		
in the 30th Circuit Court o 2. Bond on appeal is ☐ filed. ☐ a 3. ☑ The transcript has been order	ttached. □ waived		emarieAquilin (Bar No. <u>37670</u>
In It is a state of the stranscript has been ordered.In It is a stranscript has been filed.In It is a stranscript has been filed.In It is a stranscript has been ordered.	ea.		
4. THIS APPEAL INVOLVES A C	CONTEST AS TO	THE CUSTODY OF	A MINOR CHILD. MCR 7.204(D)(3)(a
5. THIS APPEAL INVOLVES A F	RULING THAT ME	ETS THE REQUIRE	EMENTS OF MCR 7.204(D)(3)(b).
Date: 07/19/2013	Appellant/A	ttorney's Signature:	/s/ Heather S. Meingast
(mm/dd/yyyy)	Business A 525 W. Ott	ddress: awa, P.O. Box 3021	1 7 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Lansing, N	/II 48909	
	Telephone	Number:	

(10/06) E-File Claim of Appeal

MCR 7.204

Trial Court/Tribunal Name:

Court of Appeals, State of Michigan

Jurisdictional Checklist

CASE NO. Trial Court/Tribunal:

Case Name: Gracie Webster & Veronica Thomas v Rick Snyder, Andy Dillo INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete this checklist and file with your claim of appenumbered items are required. Check each box as you confirm that each item is	eal. ALL of the being filed.
INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete this checklist and file with your claim of appenumbered items are required. Check each box as you confirm that each item is	being filed.
	M/D\/4\ \$ /D\ 1
1. A signed claim of appeal showing the correct lower court number(s). [MCR 7.20])4(D)(1) & (D).]
 A filing fee of \$375.00 or appropriate fee substitute. [MCR 7.202(3) & 7.204(B)(2 court or tribunal numbers are involved, an additional filing fee may be required. Appella additional amount required.) 	2).] (Where multiple lower nts will be advised of any
3. A copy of the order you are appealing. [MCR 7.204(C)(1).] (This is the order decided order denying reconsideration, new trial, or other post-judgment relief.)	ling the merits and not an
Evidence that the necessary transcript has been ordered. [MCR 7.204(C)(2).] (Control of the control of the cont	Only one item from
a. No transcript will be filed. [MCR 7.204(C)(2) & AO 2004-5 ¶ 8(A)(1).]	
b. The transcript has already been filed. [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(a).]	
c. The complete transcript has been ordered. [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(a).]	
d. This appeal is from a probate court proceeding which does not require a [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(b).]	complete transcript.
e. A motion has been filed in the lower court or tribunal for submission of the the complete transcript. [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(c).]	ne appeal on less than
f. The parties have stipulated to submission of the appeal on less than the [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(d).]	complete transcript.
g. The parties have stipulated to a statement of facts. [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(e)	.]
4. Evidence that the necessary transcript has been ordered. [MCR 7.204(C)(2).] (C) a through g is required). a. No transcript will be filed. [MCR 7.204(C)(2) & AO 2004-5 ¶ 8(A)(1).] b. The transcript has already been filed. [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(a).] c. The complete transcript has been ordered. [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(a).] d. This appeal is from a probate court proceeding which does not require a [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(b).] e. A motion has been filed in the lower court or tribunal for submission of the complete transcript. [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(c).] f. The parties have stipulated to submission of the appeal on less than the [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(d).] g. The parties have stipulated to a statement of facts. [MCR 7.210(B)(1)(e) of the parties have been served.]	204(C)(3).] (Even if a
6. A current register of actions from the lower court or tribunal. [MCR 7.204(C)(5).	.]
6. A current register of actions from the lower court or tribunal. [MCR 7.204(C)(5). Finality of Order Being Appealed (Check the box that demonstrates your claim of apparent applies, you do not have an appeal by right.)	eal is by right. If neither
The claim of appeal is from an order defined as a final order by MCR 7.202(6) or M 7.203(A)(1).] Please specify which category of final order applies: MCR 7.202(6)(CR 5.801(B)(1). [MCR (a)(i)
The claim of appeal is from an order defined as a final order by MCR 7.202(6) or M 7.203(A)(1).] Please specify which category of final order applies: MCR 7.202(6)(1) The claim of appeal is from an order which is designated by statute, court rule, or c appealable by right to the Court of Appeals. Please specify the authority under which by right: MCR 2.605(E) 7/19/13 Date Preparer's Signature	ase law as an order ch you have an appeal
(r)	
<u>7/19/13</u>	
Date Preparer's Signature	6/0

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE $\mathbf{30}^{\mathrm{TH}}$ CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF INGHAM

WEBSTER, ETH,	
Plaintiff,	ORDER
${f v}$	HON. ROSEMARIE E. AQUILINA
RICKSNYDER, ETAL.	Docket No: 13-734-CZ
Defendant.	
At a session of said County of Ingh of Lansing, County of Ingh this day of PRESENT: The Honorable Rose 30 th Judicial Circuit	am, State of Michigan, July, 201_ emarie E. Aquilina
Upon review of motion, and a hearing being	g held in open court, and argument having
been heard, and being fully apprised of the issues, s	states the following:
IT IS ORDERED that DEFENDAN	175' MOTION FOR SUMMARY
DISPOSITION IS DENIED FOR	THE REASONS STATED
FROM THE BENCH.	
IT IS SO ORDERED.	Hon. Rosemarie E. Aquilina (P37670) Circuit Court Judge
Approved as to form: Plaintiff / Plaintiff's Attorney	Defendant / Defendant's Attorney

Filed 10/17/13 Entered 10/17/13 14:05:11

Page 3 of 6

Doc 1220-1

13-53846-tjt

STATE OF MICHIGAN IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF INGHAM

GRACIE WEBSTER and VERONICA THOMAS,

Plaintiffs,

· VS

Case No. 13-734-CZ Hon. Rosemarie Aquilina

THE STATE OF MICHIGAN; RICHARD SNYDER, as Governor of the State of Michigan; and ANDY DILLON, as Treasurer of the State of Michigan,

Defendants.

ORDER OF DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

At a session of said Court held in Ingham County Circuit Court, State of Michigan, this 1999 day of July, 2013.

PRESENT:

Circuit Court Judge

Plaintiffs request declaratory relief pursuant to MCR 2.605 concerning (1) the constitutionality under Article IX Section 24 of the Michigan Constitution of the Local Financial Stability and Choice Act, 2012 PA 436, MCL 141.1541, et seq. ("PA 436"), insofar as PA 436 permits the Governor to authorize an emergency manager to proceed under chapter 9 of the bankruptcy code, chapter 9 of title 11 of the United States Code, 29 USC 901 to 946 ("Chapter 9") in a manner which threatens to diminish or impair accrued pension benefits; and (2) the

authority of the Governor and/or State Treasurer to authorize an emergency manager to proceed under Chapter 9 in a manner which threatens to diminish or impair accrued pension benefits.

Plaintiffs have requested, and Defendants have agreed in their Response, that the hearing in this matter may be advanced pursuant to MCR 2.605(D) and the court finds that expedited treatment is appropriate and that final declaratory relief is proper at this time.

The Court having reviewed the parties filings and submissions, and having heard oral argument by counsel for the parties, and being otherwise fully advised in the premises, and for the reasons stated on the record,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

PA 436 is unconstitutional and in violation of Article IX Section 24 of the Michigan Constitution to the extent that it permits the Governor to authorize an emergency manager to proceed under Chapter 9 in any manner which threatens to diminish or impair accrued pension benefits; and PA 436 is to that extent of no force or effect;

The Governor is prohibited by Article IX Section 24 of the Michigan Constitution from authorizing an emergency manager under PA 436 to proceed under Chapter 9 in a manner which threatens to diminish or impair accrued pension benefits, and any such action by the Governor is without authority and in violation of Article IX Section 24 of the Michigan Constitution.

On July 16, 2013, City of Detroit Emergency Manager Kevyn Orr submitted a recommendation to Defendant Governor Snyder and Defendant Treasurer Dillon pursuant to Section 18(1) of PA 436 to proceed under Chapter 9, which together with the facts presented in Plaintiffs' filings, reflect that Emergency Manager Orr intended to diminish or impair accrued pension benefits if he were authorized to proceed under Chapter 9. On July 18, 2013, Defendant

Governor Snyder approved the Emergency Manager's recommendation without placing any contingencies on a Chapter 9 filing by the Emergency Manager; and the Emergency Manager filed a Chapter 9 petition shortly thereafter. By authorizing the Emergency Manager to proceed. under Chapter 9 to diminish or impair accrued pension benefits, Defendant Snyder acted without authority under Michigan law and in violation of Article IX Section 24 of the Michigan Constitution.

In order to rectify his unauthorized and unconstitutional actions described above, the Governor must (1) direct the Emergency Manager to immediately withdraw the Chapter 9 petition filed on July 18, and (2) not authorize any further Chapter 9 filing which threatens to A copy of this Order shall be transmitted. President Obama. diminish or impair accrued pension benefits.

It is so Ordered.

Circuit Court Judge